DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 412 CS 503 837

AUTHOR Harris, Karen R.; And Others
TITLE The Relationships between Pupil Control Ideology, Self-Concept and Teacher Personality: Dimensions of Teacher Effectiveness.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (32nd, Boston, MA, May 2-5, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authoritarianism; Behavioral Science Research; Cognitive Style; Communication Research; Higher Education; *Humanism; Occupational Surveys; *Personality Traits; Preservice Teacher Education; *Self Concept; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Pupil Control Ideology

ABSTRACT

A study examined the personality characteristics and self-concepts of 110 teachers-in-training to see how these variables related to the subjects' humanistic versus authoritarian orientations toward pupil control. It was found that the humanistically oriented educators tended to be emotionally stable, realistic, expedient, happy-go-lucky, imaginative, venturesome, outgoing, relaxed, inner-directed, self-assured, and high in self-concept. The authoritarian educators were more affected by feelings, conscientious, sober, practical, shy, reserved, tense, frustrated, apprehensive, and unlikely to compromise, as well as low in self-concept. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED216412

The Relationships Between Pupil Control Ideology, Self-Concept and Teacher Personality: Dimensions of Teacher Effectiveness

Karen R. Harris
Purdue University

Glennelle Halpin
Auburn University

Gerald Halpin
Auburn University

Debbie Roach
University of Oklahoma

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen R. Harris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503837

Paper presented to the Instructional Division of the International Communication Association

May, 1982

Within the overall framework of communication, the construct of teacher effectiveness has been a largely emphasized area of theory and research. From studies of teacher credibility (Andersen & Clevenger, 1963) to the effects of both verbal and nonverbal behaviors on teacher effectiveness (Scott & Nussbaum, 1981; Applegate, 1980; Elliott, 1979; Andersen, 1979), researchers have attempted to assess both the teacher effectiveness construct as a whole and the many variables which affect learning outcomes. Despite an abundance of research efforts, however, few actual advances have been made in the area (Heath & Nielsen, 1974; Friedrich, 1978; Andersen, 1979). As Andersen (1979) states, "weak conceptual understanding of teacher competence, poor operationalizations and research designs, and narrow definitions of learning outcomes" dominate research in the area. The question, then, becomes: in what ways can we extend the area of instructional communication research concerning the teacher effectiveness construct? The present research study attempts one answer to the problem.

As stated earlier, many studies have focused on the overall construct of teacher effectiveness and the many variables which affect learning outcomes. Few studies, however, have focused on the dimensions of teacher effectiveness, or on those components of teacher effectiveness which themselves may be actually subject to effects of manipulation. One such dimension is that of pupil control orientation, or the degree to which an individual may be conceptualized on an humanitarian-authoritarian continuum, and the resulting effects of this position on communication outcomes. By focusing on studies of such a dimension and on the specific variables which affect its natural behavior, information may be added to our "knowledge" of the pupil control orientation dimension itself (which has been well

researched in other academic disciplines), the teacher effectiveness construct as a whole, and the effects of pupil control orientations on communication and learning outcomes. Although each of these questions will not be addressed specifically at this time, it is hoped that this study will both (1) extend research concerning possible dimensions of teacher effectiveness, and (2) add to our knowledge of the variables which affect classroom control.

Pupil Control Orientation: A Function of Personality and Self-Concept

Pupil control orientation can be conceptualized on a continuum ranging from authoritarian to humanistic. Teachers with an authoritarian pupil control orientation stress the maintenance of order, impersonality, one-way communication, distrust of students, and a punitive, moralistic attitude. Teachers with a humanistic orientation emphasize the psychological and sociological bases of learning and behavior, an accepting, trusting view of students, and confidence in students' ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. An individual teacher's pupil control orientation may fall anywhere between these two extremes. Research indicates that teachers with a humanistic orientation have fewer problems with classroom discipline and are able to foster interest in the learning process (Kounin & Gump, 1961; Lunenberg & O'Reilly, 1974).

Clearly, then, a humanistic control orientation seems desirable, but in what type of teacher is such a control orientation most likely to be found? It seems reasonable to assume that the answer to this question could be found, at least in part, through a study of teacher personality and self-concept.

Previous Research

Wakefield and Cunningham (1975), after analyzing responses by teachers-in-training to the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF), concluded that attitudes toward students among the teachers-in-training seemed to be determined in part by measurable personality traits. Three relationships were specifically defined. Teachers-in-training who revealed on the MTAI a rigid and severe attitude toward handling children were characterized by the 16 PF as tender-minded. They tended to dislike crude people, rough occupations, and unrealistic fussiness. The "tender-minded" teachers also tended to be expedient and forthright. Wakefield and Cunningham suggested that they would depend heavily on severe disciplinary measures rather than a conscientious handling of student behavior. Secondly, the teachers-in-training who saw children as irresponsible, lacking in self-discipline, and acquiescent to the teacher tended to be trusting and controlled. Finally, those teachers-in-training who emphasized conflict between themselves and students tended to be apprehensive and anxious about the classroom situation.

In another study, Wakefield, Cunningham, and Edwards (1975) compared responses by teachers-in-training to the MTAI and two other personality measures, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Vocational Preference Inventory. In this study the hostile teachers-in-training saw children as lacking in responsibility and in need of help, whereas the secure individuals emphasized equality between the teacher and pupil. The teachers-in-training characterized as self-controlled and self-centered were found to expect these same traits in children and to view those children who failed to show these same traits as irresponsible. Additionally,

teachers-in-training lacking in the ability to identify with their students and consider them as individuals expressed greater rigidity in handling and communicating with pupils.

Victor (1976) used several different instruments to investigate the relationships between beliefs about educational processes and four personality variables: dogmatism, self-disclosure, interpersonal flexibility, and field independence. Teachers-in-training who emphasized the value of subject matter and maintaining a social distance from their students were found to be more dogmatic than their peers. They were more inclined to rely on absolute authority because they tended to view the world as a threatening place. Those who viewed the students' psychological well-being as important were found to be high in willingness to disclose personal information. In addition, interpersonal flexibility was found to be related to the attitude of allowing student direction, or control, in the classroom learning process.

The relationship between dogmatism and pupil control orientation among elementary school teachers was investigated by Lunenburg and O'Reilly (1974). They found that low dogmatic (open-minded) teachers were significantly more humanistic in their pupil control orientation than high dogmatic teachers.

Researchers have also hypothesized that teacher self-concept is related to pupil control orientation. Teachers with a positive, stable self-concept appear to cope more effectively in the classroom than those who feel threatened by children (and/or other adults) and whose self-image is stable (Horn & Morrison, 1965; Stevens, 1976). Harley (1975) has investigated the relationship between teacher self-concept and dogmatism. He

found that teachers-in-training with a high self-concept, as compared to those with a low self-concept, tended to be less dogmatic, to possess an internal locus of control, and to be more effective in their interactions with others.

The relationship between self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and pupil control orientation among public school teachers was investigated by Brenneman in 1975. Acceptance of others was found to be significantly related to humanism in pupil control, while self-acceptance was not. These results seem to conflict somewhat with those of Harley (1975).

Focus of the Present Study

Although these prior studies give some indication as to the possible relationship between personality, self-concept, and pupil control ideology, they fail to provide definitive answers. Are attitudes of teachers and other educators toward pupils (more specifically, pupil control) really determined in large part by measurable personality traits as Wakefield and Cunningham (1976) suggested? Is there an identifiable personality--self-concept profile that characterizes and differentiates the educator with a humanistic control orientation and the educator with an authoritarian control orientation? This study was designed to answer these questions.

One specific purpose of this study was to determine if there are personality characteristics which, individually or in combination, are related to pupil control orientation. A second purpose was to determine if self-concept, alone or in combination with personality factors, is related to pupil control orientation. A third purpose was to determine if the relationships between self-concept, personality, and pupil control ideology are different for teachers-in-training at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

Subjects were 110 students enrolled in teacher certification programs at a large university. Of these students, 49 were undergraduates, while 61 were graduate students. All subjects completed the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire - Form A, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and the Pupil Control Ideology Form. These instruments were administered following standardized procedures to the subjects in their respective classes by one of the researchers. Scoring was done by the researchers following the objective scoring procedures outlined in the respective test manuals.

Instruments

Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF). The 16 PF (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970) is a factor analytically developed inventory designed to comprehensively measure personality from young adulthood to later maturity. Form A contains 187 items with three alternative answers. The personality factors measured by the 16 PF are: Factor A--reserved versus outgoing, Factor B--dull versus bright, Factor C--affected by feelings versus emotionally stable, Factor E--humble versus assertive, Factor F--sober versus happy-go-lucky, Factor G--expedient versus conscientious, Factor H--shy versus venturesome, Factor I--tough-minded versus tender-minded, Factor L--trusting versus suspicious, Factor M--practical versus imaginative, Factor N--forthright versus astute, Factor O--self-assured versus apprehensive, Factor Q_1--conservative versus experimenting, Factor Q_2--group dependent versus self-sufficient, Factor Q_3--undisciplined self-conflict versus controlled, and Factor Q_4--relaxed versus

tense. Cattell (1964) characterized these 16 personality factors as follows: They leave out no important aspect of the total personality, they are relatively independent of each other, and they are all known to be important in the sense of each having a wide influence on behavior.

Reliability and validity evidence for the 16 PF, reported primarily in terms of factor loadings and factor stability, is acceptable (Cattell, Eber, Tatsuoka, et al., 1970). Particularly pertinent to the present study are stability coefficients over a 2-day period for college students ranging from .68 to .86 (see The manual for the 16 PF, 1972).

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) is a 100-item Likert-type scale where respondents rate the extent to which self-descriptive statements are true or false of them. The response alternatives range from 5 (completely true) to 1 (completely false). Although a number of subscores may be obtained from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, only the total positive score was used in this study. Fitts (1965) refers to this measure, which reflects the overall level of self-esteem, as the most important single score obtainable from his inventory.

Substantial evidence as to the validity of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale has been reported (Knapp, 1973). Retest reliabilities, while varying for the different subscores, are generally in the high .80s (Bentler, 1972). For college students specifically, Fitts (1965) reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .92 over a 2-week period.

Pupil Control Ideology Form. The Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967) contains 20 statements which represent facets of school life. Respondents react to each statement on a 5-point, Likert-type scale. The responses are scored from 5 (strongly agree) to

1 (strongly disagree). The total score on the instrument represents the respondent's pupil control orientation. The higher the score, the more authoritarian the pupil control orientation; the lower the score, the more humanistic the pupil control orientation.

Summarizing several validity studies, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy (1967) reported that teachers' perceptions of their pupil control orientations were usually congruent with classifications by principals of these teachers with regard to their control orientations. Regarding reliability, Halpin, Goldenberg, and Halpin (1974) obtained a stability coefficient of .86 over a 7-day period for the Pupil Control Ideology Form administered to undergraduates which supports the adequacy of this instrument for use in research with college students.

Analyses and Results

Pearson product moment and stepwise multiple correlation analyses were used to determine the bivariate and multiple correlations between pupil control ideology and individual and combined personality factors and self-concept. A dummy variable was created using class standing (graduate versus undergraduate) and entered into the equation after the self-concept and personality variables. Next the product of the dummy variable and each of the self-concept and personality predictor variables were entered into the equation to determine if class standing moderated the multiple correlation between self-concept, personality, and pupil control orientation. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Pearson product moment correlations between pupil control orientation and eight of the 16 personality factors were significant ($p < .05$). These personality factors were Factor C (affected by feelings versus emotionally stable), Factor G (expedient versus conscientious), Factor F (sober versus happy-go-lucky), Factor M (practical versus imaginative), Factor H (shy versus venturesome), Factor A (reserved versus outgoing), Factor Q_4 (relaxed versus tense) and Factor O (self-assured versus apprehensive). Total self-concept was also significantly related to pupil control orientation.

A multiple correlation of .56 was obtained between pupil control orientation and the 16 personality factors, self-concept, and class standing. However, as can be seen in Table 1, a multiple correlation coefficient of .53 was obtained from the first five personality variables that were entered into the equation. The addition of the other 11 personality factors, self-concept, and class standing was of no practical or statistical significance (F [13, 91] = .42, $p < .05$) in accounting for pupil control orientation.

When the interactions of class standing by predictor variables were entered into the equation, there was an increase in the multiple R from .56 to .72. The fact that class standing did not increase the multiple R significantly (F [17, 74] = 1.74, $p < .05$) indicates that this variable did not moderate the multiple correlation between the predictors and pupil control orientation. The relationships between self-concept--personality and pupil control ideology were not significantly different for graduate and undergraduate students.

Discussion

A differentiating self-concept--personality profile for teachers-in-training does emerge in this study. In the multiple correlation analysis, five variables (Factors C, G, F, I, and M on the 16 PF) accounted for 28% of the variance in pupil control orientation. Although Factor I (touch-minded versus tender-minded) was not significantly correlated to pupil control ideology in the bivariate analysis, this variable provided more unique information than some other variables that were significantly related in the bivariate analysis. Eight of the 16 personality variables and self-concept were significantly related to pupil control orientation in the bivariate analysis. These relationships are summarized in Table 2. Of these variables, the last four personality characteristics and self-concept did not contribute significantly to the multiple correlation analysis. However, all nine bivariate correlations represent non-chance relationships on non-cognitive measures and thus provide important information.

Insert Table 2 about here

Based on definitions supplied with the 16 PF (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970), the humanistic teachers-in-training could be characterized as emotionally mature and realistic about life. Disliking rules, they may also be called expedient. These persons tend to be attentive to people, cheerful, expressive, enthusiastic, adaptable, easy-going, and relaxed. As such, they can handle wear and tear in emotional situations without fatigue and are less susceptible to stress. These humanistic

educators are self-assured and confident about their ability to deal with things. They are also spontaneous, inner-directed, unconventional, uninhibited, and less afraid of criticism. From the standpoint of self-concept, the humanistically oriented educators rated high. They are persons who tend to like themselves, feel that they are valuable, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly (Fitts, 1965).

Generally opposite personality characteristics and view of self were found to characterize the teacher trainees with an authoritarian orientation. The authoritarian educators seem to be low in frustration tolerance and easily upset and annoyed. They also tend to be exacting in character, dominated by a sense of duty, persevering, responsible, and planful. These individuals are anxious to do the right thing, careful, conventional, shy, restrained, and rule bound. Reserved, stiff, critical, and cool also describe them. They are likely to avoid compromises to viewpoints and to be precise and rigid in personal standards and actions. The authoritarian educators also seem to be tense, frustrated, driven, and overwrought. Further, they are likely to be apprehensive, moody, brooding, scrupulous, and fussy. People, to these individuals, are not as moral as they should be (Cattell, et al., 1970). With regard to self-concept, authoritarian teachers-in-training rated lower than their humanistic counterparts. They tend to be doubtful about their own worth, may see themselves as undesirable, often feel depressed, anxious, and unhappy, and have less faith or confidence in themselves (Fitts, 1965).

The personality characteristics found to be related to pupil control orientations are highly consistent with the definitions of humanism and authoritarianism given by Willower, et al. (1967). The teacher with a

humanistic orientation is characterized by Willower, et al. (1967) as accepting, trusting, and confident in his/her students' ability to be self-disciplining and responsible. The authoritarian teacher stresses the maintenance of order, impersonality, one-way communication, distrust of students, and a punitive, moralistic attitude. These definitions correspond well with the personality profiles found in this study.

The results of this study appear to be fairly consistent with the findings of previous studies on teacher personality, self-concept, and attitudes toward education. However, emerging from this study is a clearer personality--self-concept profile of the humanistic teacher and the authoritarian teacher. One inconsistency between results in this study and results from a previous study should be noted, however. As discussed earlier, Wakefield and Cunningham (1976) found a rigid and severe attitude toward handling children, as indicated by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, related to both expediency and tender-mindedness, as measured by the 16 PF. In the present study, however, both expediency and tender-mindedness were found to be related to a humanistic pupil control orientation. A humanistic pupil control orientation reflects attitudes toward classroom control that are quite the opposite of "rigid and severe." Intuitively, it would seem likely that teachers who emphasize rigidity and severity in the class (e.g., authoritarian teachers) would display personality traits opposite of expedient (defined as a refusal to be bound by rules) and tender-minded (defined as a dislike for unrealistic fussiness and crude people). This likelihood was supported in this study but not in the research by Wakefield and Cunningham.

Implications for Future Research

Although this study has focused specifically on the dimension of pupil control orientation, its findings are important for the study of "teacher effectiveness" as a whole. Several research questions concerning teacher effectiveness emerge in light of previous research. (1) How does pupil control orientation affect the verbal behaviors which teachers exhibit? (2) To what degree can nonverbal behaviors act as predictors of humanitarian-authoritarian control? Researchers should investigate the relationships between pupil control orientation and such variables as immediacy (Andersen, 1979), teachers' affective communication (McLaughlin, Erickson, & Ellison, 1980), source credibility (Wheeless, 1976), self disclosure (Wheeless, 1976), communicator style (Norton, 1977; 1978), or combinations of these variables (Scott & Nussbaum, 1981; Nussbaum & Scott, 1979). (3) To what degree is pupil control orientation related to specific cognitive, affective and behavioral measures of learning? An understanding of these individual relationships will clarify the role of pupil control orientation as a predictor of learning and comprehension. And finally, (4) how is pupil control orientation related to overall teacher effectiveness? Answers to these four questions may help to establish pupil control orientation as an important dimension of the construct of teacher effectiveness.

Table 1

Summary of Pearson and Stepwise Multiple Correlations Between Personality Factors, Self-Concept, and Pupil Control Ideology for Graduate and Undergraduate Education Students

Step	Variable	Multiple R	Multiple R Square	Pearson r
1	Factor C	.33**	.11	-.33**
2	Factor G	.41**	.17	.26**
3	Factor F	.47**	.22	-.29**
4	Factor I	.50**	.25	-.15
5	Factor M	.53**	.28	-.27**
6	Self-Concept	.53**	.28	-.23*
7	Factor E	.54**	.29	-.11
8	Factor H	.55**	.30	-.30**
9	Factor B	.55**	.30	-.13
10	Factor L	.56**	.31	.15
11	Factor N	.56**	.31	.15
12	Factor A	.56**	.31	-.24*
13	Factor Q_4	.56**	.31	.19*
14	Factor O	.56**	.31	.22*
15	Factor Q_3	.56**	.31	.00
16	Factor Q_2	.56**	.31	.14
17	Factor Q_1	.56**	.31	.00
18	Class Standing	.56**	.31	-.02
19	Interaction Terms	.72**	.51	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Table 2

Summary of Personality Variables and Self-Concept

Related to Pupil Control Orientation

	Pupil Control Orientation	
Personality/Self-Concept	Humanistic	Authoritarian
Personality Factor		
C[a]	Emotionally Stable	Affected by Feelings
G[a]	Expedient	Conscientious
F[a]	Happy-Go-Lucky	Sober
M[a]	Imaginative	Practical
H	Venturesome	Shy
A	Outgoing	Reserved
Q_4	Relaxed	Tense
O	Self-Assured	Apprehensive
Self-Concept	High Self-Concept	Low Self-Concept

[a]Significant contributors in the multiple correlation analysis.

Bibliography

Andersen, J. F. Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Association, 1979;

Andersen, K., & Clevenger, T., Jr. A summary of experimental research in ethos. Speech Monographs, 1963, 20, 49-78.

Applegate, J. L. Adaptive communication in educational contexts: A study of teachers' communicative strategies. Communication Education, 1980, 29, 158-170.

Bentler, P. M. Review of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Brenneman, O. N. Teacher self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and pupil control ideology. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975 (June), 35A, 6961.

Cattell, R. B. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF). Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1964.

Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF). Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

Elliott, S. Perceived homophily as a predictor of classroom learning. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Association, 1979.

Fitts, W. H. Manual: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Nashville, Tenn.: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Friedrich, G. W. Effect of teacher behavior on the acquisition of communication competencies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, 1978.

Halpin, G., Goldenberg, R., & Halpin, G. Are creative teachers more humanistic in their pupil control ideologies? Journal of Creative Behavior, 1974, 7, 282-286.

Harley, M. D. The relationship between self-concept of teacher-trainees and dogmatism, locus of control, and teacher-student interaction effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975 (April), 35A, 6555.

Heath, R., & Nielson, M. A. The research basis for performance-based teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 463-484.

Horn, J. L., & Morrison, W. L. Dimensions of teacher attitudes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 118-125.

Knapp, J. A selection of self-concept measures. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 080 534)

Kounin, J. S., & Gump, P. V. The comparative influence of punitive and non-punitive teachers upon children's concepts of school misconduct. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1961, 52, 44-49.

Lunenburg, F. C., & O'Reilly, R. R. Personal and organizational influence on pupil control ideology. Journal of Experimental Education, 1974, 42, 31-35.

McLaughlin, M. L., Erickson, K. V., & Ellison, M. A. A scale for the measurement of teachers' affective communication. Communication Education, 1980, 29, 21-32.

Manual for the 16 PF. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972.

Norton, R. W. Foundation of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 99-112.

Norton, R. W. Teacher effectiveness as a function of communicator style. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Association, 1977.

Nussbaum, J. F., & Scott, M. D. Instructor communication behaviors and their relationship to classroom learning. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction-International Communication Association, 1979.

Scott, M. D., & Nussbaum, J. F. Student perceptions of instructor communication behaviors and their relationship to student evaluation. Communication Education, 1981, 30, 44-53.

Stevens, B. J. Classroom coping related to teacher's image of self. Pennsylvania School Journal, 1976, 125, 22-23.

Victor, J. B. Relation between teacher belief and teacher personality in four samples of teacher trainees. Journal of Experimental Education, 1976, 45, 4-9.

Wakefield, J. A., & Cunningham, C. H. Related factors of the MTAI and the 16 PF. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 149-151.

Wakefield, J. A., Cunningham, C. H., & Edwards, D. D. Teacher attitudes and personality. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 12, 345-347.

Wheeless, L. R. The relationship of attitude and credibility to comprehension and selective exposure. Western Speech, 1974, 38, 85-97.

Wheeless, L. R. Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 47-61.

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. The school and pupil control ideology (The Pennsylvania State University Studies Number 24). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1967.